

Application No. 09/966,685
Amendment "A" dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed February 4, 2005

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on March 17, 2005. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The first Office Action, mailed February 4, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-28. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 20-23 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being anticipated by Lohtia (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023690). Claims 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohtia further in view of Shteyn (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0058096). Claims 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohtia, further in view of Chow (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002678)¹.

By this paper, claims 1, 16, 21 and 26 have been amended, while claims 14-15 have been cancelled and while new claim 29-30 have been added, such that claims 1-13 and 16-30 remain pending, of which claims 1 and 16 are the only independent claims at issue.

As discussed during the interview, the present invention is generally directed to embodiments for providing notifications to users in a context sensitive manner. The recited claims include, for example, accessing a current context of a user upon first identifying an event to notify a user of upon identifying a designated device that the notification is to be sent to. Inasmuch as a plurality of different notification methods are possible to be used to send the notification to the designated device, the method also includes determining which notification method to use based on the current context of the user. The notification is then sent.

It will be appreciated, however, as clarified during the interview, that identifying a context sensitive type of notification to send is different than merely identifying which device to send a notification to, as Lohtia does. In fact, while Lohtia recognizes that different types of notifications can be sent to a single device, Lohtia fails to consider or suggest any method for selecting a context sensitive type of notification to be sent. Instead, Lohtia is merely concerned with sending notifications to an appropriate one of several devices so that the user is not burdened with having to deal with and delete duplicate notifications sent to all of the user's

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 09/966,685
Amendment "A" dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed February 4, 2005

devices. (Abstract, paragraphs [0003]-[0004], [0012], [0015]-[0016]). For at least this reason, the claims were clearly distinguished from Lohtia during the interview.

The other cited art Shteyn and Chow also fail to consider the selection of context sensitive notification types. In fact, these references were only used to reject some of the dependent claims and will not, therefore, be addressed in detail at this time inasmuch as the dependent claims should be found allowable for at least the same reasons independent claims 1 and 16 are distinguished from the art of record.

The new dependent claims clarify that the context of the user can correspond to the busy status and the hands free status of the designated device that is to receive the notification. Again, this is something that is not considered or addressed by the cited art. Support for these claims is found throughout Applicants specification, including paragraph 31.

For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 30 day of March, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\13768\233\CM0000005732V001.DOC